

## Memorandum

Date: February 8, 2000

To: Ecosystem Roundtable Project Amendment Subcommittee

From: Wendy Halverson Martin

*Wendy Halverson Martin*

Subject: Requests for Project Amendments

### SUMMARY

Four projects have requested a Level 1 amendment and two projects have requested a Level 2 amendment. Level 1 amendments do not require Ecosystem Roundtable or Agency Liaison action, and are included for information.

Project and Proponent	Level 1 Project Amendments Change Requested			Reason for Amendment
	Budget	Scope	Time	
Inventory of Forest Road Systems, Cat Creek Watershed (98-B10) US Forest Service	None	None	9 months (to June 30, 2000)	To allow time to fix forest GIS layers for streams and roads.
Sonoma Creek Watershed (98-E02) Southern Sonoma County Resource Conservation District	None	None	to Dec 31, 2000	To accommodate delays in selecting a benchmark watershed due to landowner reluctance to allow access for survey work.
Napa River Watershed (98-E01) Napa County Resource Conservation District	None	None	6 months (to Dec 31, 2000)	To properly time the restoration projects, they needed to be done in the late summer and fall (low flow).
Fish Passage at Red Bluff Diversion Dam—Feasibility Study (98-B22) Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority	None	None	2 months (to Feb 28, 2000)	To allow time for agency review and comment on draft report.

### CALFED Agencies

**California**  
The Resources Agency  
Department of Fish and Game  
Department of Water Resources  
California Environmental Protection Agency  
State Water Resources Control Board  
Department of Food and Agriculture

**Federal**  
Environmental Protection Agency  
Department of the Interior  
Fish and Wildlife Service  
Bureau of Reclamation  
U.S. Geological Survey  
Bureau of Land Management  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

**Department of Agriculture**  
Natural Resources Conservation Service  
U.S. Forest Service  
Department of Commerce  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Western Area Power Administration

Two projects have requested a Level 2 project amendment. These amendments require Ecosystem Roundtable and Agency Liaison action.

Level 2 Project Amendments				
Project and Proponent	Change Requested			Reason for Amendment
	Budget	Scope	Time	
Cache Slough habitat enhancement (98-B08) RD No. 2060	None	None	18 months (to Mar 31, 2001)	To coordinate with Corps levee work.
Small Diversion Fish Screen Program (98-R01) NRCS	None	Reallocate construction funds to engineering.	None	To allow site-specific modifications to handle silt load.

## ACTION

Roundtable Subcommittee members and Agency Liaisons are requested to consider the Level 2 amendment consistent with the contract amendment process (attached). The Level 1 amendments do not require Ecosystem Roundtable or Agency Liaison action, and are included for information.

## DISCUSSION

The contract amendment process provides for three levels of amendment depending on the nature and extent of the proposed change (budget, time, or scope). The process for these amendments is discussed on the attached page.

### ***Project Amendments***

One project has requested a project amendment requiring Ecosystem Roundtable subcommittee action, as follows:

#### **1. Cache Slough habitat enhancement (98-B08)**

**Issue:** In February 1998, CALFED approved \$85,000 for the planning, design, and permitting phases of this restoration of 2,000 linear feet of levee bank by Reclamation District 2060. This project is located on Hastings Tract in the North Delta, where erosion has destroyed shaded riverine aquatic habitat along Cache Slough. Instead of using traditional erosion repair of fill and riprap, the District plans to stabilize the bank and encourage revegetation. The District plans to place fill to restore the bankline to its pre-erosion condition, stabilize the fill with rock riprap, fill the riprap voids with soil, cover the bank with coconut fiber mats, and plant grasses and sedges to revegetate the bankline and re-create lost, valuable shaded riverine aquatic. In July 1999, the Bureau of Reclamation granted a 3-month time extension (Level 1). A further time extension is required to complete tasks 3 and 4 (tasks 1 and 2 are complete). The time extension does not effect the construction of the project because the construction could not occur until the summer of 2001 due to regulatory work windows and lack of construction funding.

**Staff Recommendation:** This time extension is reasonable to allow coordination

with the Corps of Engineers.

**2. Small Diversion Fish Screen Program (98-R01)**

**Issue:** In February 1998, CALFED approved \$900,000 for Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) to expand on an existing small fish screen project in Colusa County. The expanded CALFED funded effort partners with local organizations and irrigators to prioritize and screen up to 15 small diversions from the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and their tributaries. Cost sharing has been provided by a number of partners that has resulted in the financial assistance portion to install the fish screens requiring only 25% to 50% CALFED funding. This has allowed for more fish screens to be potentially installed than would otherwise be the case.

Anticipating using off-the-shelf designs, NRCS costs for technical assistance were limited to \$95,000 in the original contract. However, the NRCS has provided documentation on the failures of the original fish screen design, and is actively involved in the design and installation of new custom screens. The custom screens require substantial more technical assistance for design, installation, and operations and maintenance. The technical assistance needs to approximately five times the original estimate. The custom designed screens are also approximately five times the original off-the-shelf cost, with the original cost per installed screen exclusive of technical assistance ranging from \$25,000 (10cfs) to \$65,000 (40cfs), the new costs range from \$95,000 to \$180,000 to \$200,000. NRCS is requesting an amendment to provide the needed additional technical assistance. Two options are available, (1) reallocate funds within the existing contract from financial assistance to technical assistance, this would allow approximately five more screens to be installed, for a total of nine; (2) provide additional financial assistance estimated at \$361,000 and technical assistance estimated at \$387,000, this would allow for 15 screens to be designed and installed. NRCS prefers the second option.

**Staff Recommendation:** Reallocate the existing grant to accommodate the increased technical assistance costs.

## **Contract Amendment Process**

### ***Level 1 Amendments***

Level 1 amendments would be defined as (a) cumulative time extensions up to nine months, (b) changes in scope of services which will not alter the final outcome of the project, and (c) budget increases not to exceed a total of \$25,000 for each contract. Decisions on amendments at this level would be made by contracting agency staff after consulting with CALFED staff. Contracting agencies may delegate decision-making to the Executive Director of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, as appropriate.

### ***Level 2 Amendments***

Level 2 amendments consist of requests for (a) cumulative time extensions over 9 months, or (b) cumulative budget increases up to 30% of the contract amount, but not greater than \$500,000 or (c) changes in scope of services which alter the final outcome of the project.

These amendment requests would be considered by an Ecosystem Roundtable subcommittee which would meet in a publicly noticed meeting and consider each amendment in detail. The Ecosystem Roundtable members would provide review and comment on the proposed amendments. A group of Management Team members would participate in reviewing the contract amendments at the same meeting with members of the Roundtable subcommittee. The Management Team subgroup would then make their recommendation with the input from the Ecosystem Roundtable members. The Management Team subgroup could decide whether an individual item merits full Management Team review and discussion, and/or Policy Group review. If an item is identified as not meriting additional discussion, then the Management Team subgroup's recommendation would be transmitted directly to the appropriate contracting agency. Interior, Resources Agency, and the Environmental Protection Agency would have the final approval over their respective funding sources.

### ***Level 3 Amendments***

Level 3 amendments consist of amendment requests of cumulative budget increases of 30% or more of the contract amount or over \$500,000. Level 3 amendments will be reviewed through the same process as Level 2 amendments, but will need to be presented to the Policy Team who will transmit their recommendation to the respective funding source.

### ***Reporting***

The Management Team, Policy Group, Ecosystem Roundtable and BDAC would have all amendments reported to them as information items.